

**Serial No. 09/916,415  
Atty. Doc. No. 1999P03046US02**

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 11-15 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 4, and 11-15 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph. Claims 1, 2, 12, and 13 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohammed et al, US Patent 6,421,728 B1 ("Mohammed") in view of Lin et al, US Patent 6,282,571 B1 ("Lin"). Claims 4 and 14 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohammed in view of Lin, in further view of Baird et al, US Patent 6,564,128 ("Baird"). Claim 11 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohammed in view of Lin, in further view of Baird, and in further view of Markus Horstmann and Mary Kirtland, DCOM Architecture, Microsoft Developer's Network Library, July 23, 1997 ("Horstmann"). Claim 15 is rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mohammed in view of Lin, in further view of Horstmann.

Applicants have amended claims 1 and 12 herein. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

**Response to rejections under Section 112:**

With regard to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4 and 11-15 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for failing to describe a proxy computer in the specification, applicants respectfully submit that one skilled in the art would understand that the phase "fire wall computer 2 (=proxy)" found in paragraph [0009] of the specification clearly describes that the fire wall computer is equivalent to a proxy computer. Accordingly, applicants submit that the word "proxy" is sufficiently described so as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. However, in the interest of furthering prosecution, applicant has amended claim 1 and claim 12 to change the words "proxy computer" to "fire wall computer."

With regard to the rejection of claims 1, 2, 4, and 11-15 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, for failing to describe how a connection request is sent directly from a client to an Internet server, applicants respectfully submit that nowhere do claims 1, 2, 4 and 11-15 recite *directly*

**Serial No. 09/916,415  
Atty. Doc. No. 1999P03046US02**

sending a connection request from a client to an Internet server. Instead, claim 1 and claim 12 each recite transmitting a connection request "via an Internet connection to an Internet server." As shown in at least FIG. 1 of the published patent application and as described in at least paragraphs [0009] and [0010] of the published patent application, the Internet connection includes a firewall computer. Accordingly, applicant submits that communications between a client and an Internet server indirectly connected via one or more firewall computers is sufficiently described so as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. For all the above reasons, claims 1, 2, 4, and 11-15 are believed to be in condition for allowance with respect to 35 USC 112, first paragraph.

**Response to rejections under Section 103:**

With regard to the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103, claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the Internet client. Accordingly, amended claim 1 includes the limitation of "the client has a local Intranet address and is connected to a fire wall computer for establishing an Internet connection to the server so that the client is not directly addressable on the Internet by the Internet server" Neither Mohammed nor Lin, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests this limitation.

As accurately stated in the Office Action, Mohammed fails to disclose that the client is present behind a proxy server. Lin is applied to remedy the shortcomings of Mohammad with respect to claim 1. Lin is directed to a routing mechanism for automatically setting up network traffic routing for clients receiving downstream traffic over a cable modem and transmitting upstream traffic over a phone line. See for example, Lin, FIG. 1, column 2, lines 46-52, and column 3 lines 34-44. In particular, Lin is directed to managing client IP addresses by dynamically allocating IP addresses to clients that are directly addressable by a network routing mechanism. See for example Lin, column 2, lines 53-56, and column 5, lines 39-45. By describing clients being directly addressable by their IP addresses, Lin teaches away from a client that has "a local Intranet address and is connected to a fire wall computer for establishing an Internet connection to the server so that the client is not directly addressable on the Internet by the Internet server." Accordingly, Lin fails to remedy the shortcomings of Mohammed as applied

**Serial No. 09/916,415  
Atty. Doc. No. 1999P03046US02**

to claim 1. Neither Mohammed nor Lin, alone or in combination, teaches or suggest the limitations of claim 1. Therefore claim 1, and claims 2, 4, and 11 depending there from, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

With regard to the rejection of claim 12 under 35 USC 103, claim 12 has been amended to more clearly define the relationship between the firewall computer and the Internet client. Accordingly, amended claim 12 includes the limitations of "a client having a local Intranet address; and a fire wall computer connected to the client for establishing an Internet connection to the Internet server so that the client is not directly addressable on the Internet by the Internet server." Neither Mohammed nor Lin, alone or in combination, teaches or suggests these limitations.

As accurately stated in the Office Action, Mohammed fails to disclose that the client is present behind a proxy server. Lin is applied to remedy the shortcomings of Mohammad with respect to claim 12. Lin is directed to routing mechanism for automatically setting up network traffic routing for clients receiving downstream traffic over a cable modem and transmitting upstream traffic over a phone line. In particular, Lin is directed to managing client IP addresses by dynamically allocating IP addresses to clients that are directly addressable by a network routing mechanism. By describing clients being directly addressable by their IP addresses, Lin teaches away from "a client having a local Intranet address; and a fire wall computer connected to the client for establishing an Internet connection to the Internet server so that the client is not directly addressable on the Internet by the Internet server." Accordingly, Lin fails to remedy the shortcomings of Mohammed as applied to claim 12. Consequently, neither Mohammed nor Lin, alone or in combination, teaches or suggest the limitations of claim 12. Therefore, claim 12, and claims 13-15 depending there from, are believed to be in condition for allowance.

OCT. 3. 2006 11:27AM 407-736-6440

NO. 4579 P. 11

**Serial No. 09/916,415  
Atty. Doc. No. 1999P03046US02**

**Conclusion**

For the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections set forth in the outstanding Office Action are overcome with the amended claims presented herein. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and timely pass the application to allowance. The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including the fees specified in 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 (c), 1.17(a)(1) and 1.20(d) for total independent claims in excess of 3, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/3/06

By: JPM

John P. Musone  
Registration No. 44,961  
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830